

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of GREAT BRITAIN

Report of the Proceedings of the 39th Annual Conference

held at:

Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1. on Friday, Saturday and Sunday,  
20th, 21st and 22nd April, 1973

<u>Attendances at Conference:</u>	<u>Delegates present</u>	<u>Branches represented</u>
<u>Friday morning:</u>	31	14
afternoon:	33	14
Not represented: Bristol, Manchester, Merseyside .		
<u>Saturday</u>	28	13
Not represented: Bristol, Ealing, Manchester, W. London.		
<u>Sunday morning:</u>	28	14
Not represented: Bristol, Swansea, Manchester.		
afternoon:	31	14
Not represented: Bristol, Manchester, Swansea.		

Financial Statement

<u>Income</u>			<u>Expenditure</u>	
<u>Collections:</u>			Hall hire	£112-00
Friday	£36-22		Caretaker	5-00
Saturday	16-71½			
Sunday	12-31			
Friday Lecture	19-60			
	78-84½			£117-00
Profit from Canteen	19-80			
Book sales	10-00			
Literature sale s	£-57			£114-21½
				£ 2-98½



Comrades D'Arcy & May were nominated for the Chair. Comrade D'Arcy withdrew and Comrade May was Chairman throughout Conference. Comrades George and Miller each acted as Vice Chairman for part of the time.

Standing Orders Committee reported that there were three Edinburgh delegates sitting without credentials - they had been appointed by their Branch. Glasgow & Redbridge moved that they be allowed to sit and this was agreed.

Comrades Baldwin & D'Arcy agreed to act as Tellers.

#### RESOLUTIONS:

- 2(a) Merseyside "The Party's name be changed to 'The World Socialist Party of Great Britain'". LOST 6 - 31

At this point there was some discussion as to whether the two Manchester members be allowed to sit. (No Form C. had been received from Manchester Branch for two years, they only had a 'free hand' at a Branch meeting of 4 members, and no credentials.

Resolution: Glasgow & Mid.Herts: "That the two Manchester members be allowed to sit". The Chairman did not accept this resolution.

Resolution: Buick & "That the Chairman accept a vote of direction from the floor" The Chairman did not accept this.

'Next business' was then proposed, seconded and agreed.

- 2(b) Swansea: "That this Conference instructs the E.C. to take a Poll of the Party on the following question - "That the Party's name should be changed to 'The World Socialist Party'".

Swansea stated that this resolution comes up year after year and they were concerned merely to get the matter finalised. Waters, Westminster: A Party Poll should only be called when there is some doubt as to the support it will get. There appears to have been no great desire to change the Party's name. Party Polls should be reserved for controversial questions where there is doubt as to the opinion of the Party.

LOST 13 - 27

- 2(c) Haringey "This Conference reaffirms that nothing in the Party Rules should be so understood as to prevent any member or members from expressing criticism of the Party".

Addend: Westminster: "That the words 'within the Party' be added at the end of above".

" Swansea: "That the words 'verbally or in writing' be added at the end of Haringey resolution".

Haringey were concerned that there should be complete openness and free discussion to obtain correct Party theory. D'Arcy (Cauden): opposing. Criticism of the Party should be kept within the Party and not made to people outside. W.London, opposed. There is no necessity for this resolution. There is nothing in the Rules at the moment which prevent free discussion. Wood, Lewisham: opposed. This resolution implies that there is no criticism of the Party allowed. Where is the evidence that Party members cannot criticise the Party? Critchfield, Ealing, opposed. I would have preferred to have heard some sound reasons as to why it was thought necessary to put this on the Agenda. This Party has the freest discussion possible. McDonagh, Birmingham: All criticism should be free both inside and outside the Party. Skelton, Cent. Branch: The evidence is that the E.C. took steps to try and prevent Brighton Line criticising the Party. The fact is that the E.C. cited a Party Rule to try and prevent criticism of the Party being published. Brighton Line has been attacked because it publishes criticism of the Party. We need some medium of communication between ourselves. Waters. We talk about democracy and the right of members to criticise but we belong to a political Party and we should expect a certain amount of discipline from members. As I understand it, Brighton Group is not a recognised Branch of the Party. The Party should have control over its members and not allow a situation where non-members can criticise the Party as though that criticism was coming from the Party. Mid.Herts, supported - not because we think there is no freedom of speech in the Party but because if you vote against this you will only be saying that the Party will carry on as it always has. We spend much time criticising one another but within the rules of the Party. This resolution is a device for people to obtain a licence to do what they like.



Holford, Brighton. If you look at your Agenda you will find other resolutions concerned with different interpretations of the Rules. This resolution is a guarantee that nothing in Party rules should stop us from criticising the organisation. Baldwin, E.C. I have a shrewder view of Haringey's intention. Look at their amendment to Rule 16 and see how much they are really concerned with free speech and democracy. These resolutions are an affront to Party democracy.

Barltrop, opposed: There are facilities already in existence for free discussion. If this is passed some licence will have been given beyond what is at present allowed. should affirm the present situation. D'Arcy, Camden: The present position is that members are free to criticise the Party and oppose it within the Party, except that if they disagree with the D. of P. they should resign. This resolution has nothing to do with criticism within the Party - it means something else. The present position is that a member criticised the Party in an outside journal. It was stated there that members of the Party are members of Women's Lib. This was the reason that the E.C. took the view that this statement was derogatory to the Party. This is an effort to set aside the Rule Book - it aims at allowing members to criticise the Party outside the Party.

Westminster amendment	Lost	16 - 20
Swansea "	Lost	19 - 15
Haringey Resolution	Carried	23 - 14
as sub. Resolution	Carried	20 - 19

2(d). Haringey. "This Conference instructs the E.C. to rescind the following resolution which was carried by the 69th E.C. (7-1) at their 42nd Mtg, on 14th Nov. 1972:- "That in view of the fact that the 'Brighton Line' is not published under Party control in line with Rule 17, the E.C. would draw to the attention of members that articles critical of the Party should not be submitted to it".

Buick, Haringey: The E.C. has no authority under Rule 17 to make a decision of this kind. The only reference within the Rules to members writing articles is Rule 5 which prevents members writing in opposing political party journals. Nobody is denying that the E.C. does not control Brighton Line but does it come within the category of Party literature as mentioned in Rule 17? What are the implications of the E.C.'s decision? It would mean that members could only submit articles, critical of the Party or otherwise, after vetting by the E.C. How do you distinguish between a circular put out by a Branch and a magazine put out by a group of members? The resolution is undemocratic and illogical. A.D'Arcy, Westminster: The E.C.'s resolution is a wise one - you might have articles in Brighton Line which are libellous and the Party could be held responsible. Waters: Buick has referred to Rule 17 which clearly says the E.C. shall publish and control Party literature, and then goes on to say that Brighton Line cannot come within this category because it does not relate to a Party publication. If we turn to Rule 5 it says 'a member shall not belong to any political organisation or Party except in opposition'. Buick cannot have it both ways. Whilst Brighton Group claims to be a group of members, it has not been formed as a recognised Branch of the Party - it can include non-members who could contribute to Brighton Line critical of the Party in a way that a recognised Branch could not do. If Brighton Line is not controlled by the E.C. it is not controlled by the Party and anything written in it could be construed by people outside the Party as being the recognised policy of the Party. This should not be allowed.

Birmingham asked whether Brighton Line is published solely by Party members. Answer, yes. Mattingley, Mid. Herts. It is not sufficient that a publication shall be by Party members. It should be within the control of the Party. Whether written by Party members or not is entirely irrelevant. Is Brighton Line intended to be an inter-Party journal? I had the impression it was sold to the public at large.

Baldwin: Brighton Line is a free lance journal responsible to nobody. Non-members are perfectly entitled to become members of the Brighton Group. When Brighton Group get to the position of having enough Party members to form a Branch they will become subject to the normal Party rules which govern Branches under our normal democratic procedure - but they always prefer to remain a group. It is a question of responsible conduct within the Party. A private group which sets itself as being above Party control, as Brighton Group does, is beyond democratic control. If you pass this resolution you give the go-ahead to a free lance publication outside the control of the Party. It could become a vehicle for pressure groups, e.g. 'Squatters'. There are ample facilities for free discussion within the Party - you have Branches, Delegate Meetings and Conference where sympathisers can take part. Are you saying that before Brighton Line there were no facilities for free discussion?

Holford,  
become a  
there woul  
members  
being  
la



Holford, Brighton Group. There are geographical reasons why Brighton Group cannot become a Branch. If we attempted to become a Branch and then it went out of existence there would be a dearth of activity in Brighton. Brighton Line is produced by Party members. Sometimes we use articles which have been rejected by the S.S.P.C. as not being up to standard, and we think this is helpful to Party members. There is a lack of communication between H.O. and Central Branch members which Brighton Line helps to fill. We are an active group. All we have done is to allow the ideas of various comrades to be expressed. There are things we think Party members should know about. Brighton Line is not charged for and it is not distributed outside the Party, although I cannot say that a few copies may not get into the hands of a few people outside. P. Lawrence, E.C. Rule 17, in so far as it refers to Party literature, has always been taken to apply to propaganda - "S.S.", pamphlets, leaflets etc. which have to come before the E.C. for vetting. Brighton Line is not a propaganda journal and I think it would be undesirable and impractical for the E.C. to vet the contents of Brighton Line and difficult to get terms of reference. Brighton Line has not published anything seriously critical of the Party. Westminster were against.

In reply to a question it was stated that Brighton Line goes to our Companion Parties but it is never sold. Brick, winding up, reiterated that the E.C. has no power under Rule 17 to do what they are trying to do. This is purely a discussion journal mainly for members of the Party and it is unnecessary that it should be under the control of the E.C. or the Party.

#### Resolution LOST 15 - 23

#### Item for Discussion

- 1(a) Westminster. "Does the Party provide sufficient scope and channels for the dissemination and exchange of ideas between members?"

D'Arcy, Westminster suggested there could be letters in the "S.S." for members to exchange their views, or a newspaper between members, some kind of communication between members where ideas for propagandists could be placed in a central pool. Cox, Westminster. The Party needs to be more integrated as a whole. We are not sufficiently connected from one year to another. We do not have enough information about what Branches are doing. Delegates should mention this in their Branches. May, as C.O. There is not only a lack of communication from Conference to Conference, there is a lack of communication all the time. The fact that Branches are gathered here today does not mean they exchange ideas about propaganda etc. I have made a suggestion in my report that at every Conference or Del. Meeting a delegate from a Branch should make a Branch report every year. The Form "C" gives us certain facts and figures, not particularly inspiring. We still do not know what Branches are doing. If a delegate had to give a resume of his Branch's activity over the past 6 months this would start the ball rolling of an exchange of ideas. Carden supported this suggestion. Let us have a short statement from each Branch to be incorporated in the E.C.'s Report to Conference. The E.C. should initiate this by circularising Branches at the appropriate time.

Floor Res. Carden & Redbridge: "That this Conference recommends Branches to provide a short statement of their activities during the year for submission to the E.C. at the end of the year for incorporation in the E.C. Report to Conference and that the E.C. be asked to remind Branches of this at the appropriate time". Carried 23 - 3

Item for Discussion 1(b). Redbridge: "Review of Central Branch organisation".



- (c). Westminster: "The present inadequate arrangements available to a third of the membership in Central Branch to effectively partake in the Party's democratic decision making procedures relating to Conference and Delegate Meetings. Westminster Branch propose the following" - (see Final Agenda, I. II. III).

((b) and (c) were discussed together by delegates).

Marshall, Redbridge. We have no criticism of the C.B. Secretary - he is limited by his Terms of Reference in what he can do for C.B. members. We think it would be a good idea if some kind of organisation could be set up whereby members of C.B. who are living fairly near to each other could get together to sell literature or discuss ideas and perhaps have occasional get-togethers. K. Knight, Mid. Herts. It seems to me that the Scrutiny of Forms A. Cttee. is already a form of C.B. administration. But it would be better to organise areas of Branch membership on the basis of having a Committee at H.O. concerned with Party administration. It might be possible with the help of the Vetting Committee to divide the country into perhaps three areas, and possibly organise quarterly meetings of C.B. members. Skelton, C.B. When I left London I asked H.O. for the names of people in my area, Party members and sympathisers, and I received a list of them. A similar list could be compiled for every C.B. member. Holford, C.B. supported Westminster but thought their ideas did not go far enough.

Lawrence, C.B. Sec. was opposed to Westminster's suggestions and drew attention to the fact that only 25 C.B. members had voted on the Agenda. He considered the amount of work that would be involved in adopting Westminster's suggestions would make the scheme totally impracticable.

Item for Discussion Comrade Skelton (C.B.) sponsored by B'nham Bch. who do not necessarily agree.

- (d) I. The E.C.'s control of members' activity and the Party's resultant inertia and inability to grow, together with the relationship between Party structure, the leadership role of the E.C. and the need for all Party members to be effective and energetic spokesmen and spokeswomen.

Comrade Skelton stated that the E.C. can pass a resolution with regard to a particular issue with which members do not agree. We should try and prevent the E.C. from developing into, if it has not already become, a leadership Committee. You have a body responsible for discipline and at the same time a role in defining the Party's policy on particular issues. This is, in my opinion, leadership. The E.C. both defines policy and administers discipline. According to the Rule Book the E.C. should publish and control Party literature and generally supervise the work of the Party. But they look down at us from a high level. We should not have a leadership committee supervising us. We are all socialists. Wood, Lewisham. I find it difficult to understand what Comrade Skelton is getting at. What is the evidence that E.C. control results in inertia? It seems to me that if one or two members disagree with what the E.C. does they immediately accuse it of leadership. We are not being led - if you have a leader it implies you want to be led. If the E.C. makes a decision with which a minority of members disagree, then you can put forward that point of view and argue it out.

Marshall, Redbridge. The policy of the S.P.G.B. is determined by Conference and the E.C. carries out that policy on our behalf. To say that the E.C. guides members is totally wrong - this is not leadership. Caulfield, Manchester (speaking for himself): A situation has arisen in the Party whereby the E.C. reaches decisions which it considers to be the policy of the Party, forgetting that the socialist movement is working with history. The E.C. makes decisions independent of the rest of the Party. There is a difference between the actual practicality and what that centralised democracy claims to be. I support Comrade Skelton. K. Knight, Mid. Herts. My Branch did not discuss this item - my views are my own. I do not think there is any form of leadership in the Party. Whenever the E.C. makes a decision there is usually someone around who tries to put it in its place. The E.C. does have a job of direction but this is not leadership. All I can get from Cde. Skelton's circular is that there are some actions of the E.C. with which she does not agree.

Holford, C.B. I do not accept Cde. Skelton's implications, but I would like to suggest that when certain members come up for nomination it would be helpful if the E.C. could give members an 'address' so that they could know who they are voting for.

Baldwin, E.  
charge by the  
the E.C.'s  
defines  
st



Baldwin, E.C. Every disciplinary rule is subject to Conference confirmation. Any charge by the E.C. has to be ratified by Conference and goes to a Party Poll. Re the E.C.'s role, the rules and machinery are first laid down by the Party which defines how the E.C. operates. You must have some central organisation between Conferences. I think it is a nasty reflection on all of us to talk about the leadership role of the E.C. - the inference is that we are all ignorant sheep. Members of the E.C. are elected by the Party and there is no separation between E.C. members and non-E.C. members, and as a matter of fact, they are just as active as any other members. Cox, Westminster Some members take the view that the Party gets the E.C. it deserves. On the whole, you get the kind of E.C. which is willing to carry out the plans and wishes of the membership. It does not have centralised authority divorced from the Party. The administration of discipline is in the hands of the members, not of the E.C. Nor can it define policy. Whilst nobody will agree with everything the E.C. does, nobody has yet convinced the Party at large that where and when the E.C. is required to define an existing ruling, that it has done so in a way contrary to the wishes of the majority. Then it is up to Conference.

Comrade A. George, as Vice-President, informed delegates that he had great pleasure in introducing Comrade Rena Orner, official delegate of the WSP of U.S. who was on her third visit to the S.P.G.B. Comrade George said "The last time three of us met her was on Boston Common last year at which she spoke. She is well known to many comrades here.

Comrade Orner said she brought greetings and best wishes for a successful Conference and went on to say that workers in America are still bogged down in the mire of a credit squeeze, decrepit slums, school bussing and racism. Prices for food, clothing and shelter have soared out of reach of the mass of the workers. In the world's largest cattle grazing country the eating of horse flesh is spreading. People are in motion organised not for the abolishment of capitalism but in futile attempts to bring down prices. Wages are frozen with increases limited to about 5%. The U.S.A. stretches 3,500 miles from coast to coast. Texas is large enough to encompass three Englands. All of the 50 States but 2 are larger than England, and our membership is scattered over this vast area, Detroit, San Francisco, Tuscan, Utica, Columbus etc. increasing the difficulty of building a Party. Members have to travel vast distances during the course of a year in order to attend meetings. But our weekly radio program is productive and we are determined to carry on.

Comrade May, Chairman, stated that on behalf of all of us we would like her to take back our greetings and best wishes for their Conference later in the year.

Item for Discussion, (Birmingham on behalf of Cdo. Skelton).

- (d) II. "Whether the role of the E.C. should be to encourage, support and, where necessary, co-ordinate the work of the Party, and whether Rules 17 and 33 do not need to be revised".

Comrade Skelton expressed her satisfaction with the way her previous item had been dealt with by delegates, and agreed that the Party membership has the final word in deciding whether a member should be expelled or not via a Party Poll. This is democratic. But the initiative lies with the E.C. Rule 33 is very vague - "...acting in a manner deemed by the E.C. to be an infringement of the Principles or Rules...." This is so vague that it has not been used in ten years. Should not charges really be started by the Party, not by the E.C. at all? The E.C. should not at the same time be responsible for telling us what the Party's position on particular issues is and at the same time have the power to initiate disciplinary action. Would it not be better for the E.C. to have no connection with the disciplinary aspect? I would like to have this Rule removed and for delegates to consider relieving the E.C. of its disciplinary function.

Marshall, Redbridge: Comrade Skelton seems to fail to appreciate that the E.C. is part of the S.P.G.B., the elected representatives of our organisation, and they have to carry out the rules and regulations decided by us at Conference. Vanni, Glasgow: In my experience, when a member was expelled, a Branch had brought the charge after convening a Special Meeting. To safeguard a member being thrown out by 'personalities' a charge has to be ratified by the E.C.



New Pamphlets Committee's Report. Comrade Vanni enquired as to the position of the Irish pamphlet. Hardy (for the Committee): We have received back the revised text of the pamphlet (following an E.C. resolution) and we are dealing with this now. It would appear that the approach of Conference has stirred some people into activity. We have now received the text of "The Materialist Conception of History" and have been promised the text of a pamphlet on housing. Re 'The Case for Socialism', 400 copies have come to light at H.O. and Branches can now order copies. Gle Ballard regretted the fact that the E.C. did not go ahead with a pamphlet on free transport which he considered was one of the live issues in local politics. P. Lawrence enquired of delegates what they considered were the omissions in our present stock of literature in general. Buick: I put a pamphlet on religion at the bottom of the list. Simkins: We should have a pamphlet on the agricultural surpluses in Europe. Skelton: The "S.S." can deal with some of these, but we could have a pamphlet on the State - how we would use it.

### RESOLUTIONS

- 3(a). Ealing: "That the E.C. be instructed to appoint a sub-committee to investigate the organisation, content and sale of the SS and any other relevant matters, and to report by the end of 1973".

Amend. B Birmingham: "That the words 'and any other relevant matters' be deleted from Ealing Branch's Resolution above".

Miller: Over the last few years there have been something like 6 or 7 resolutions relating to the SS, e.g. a fortnightly journal? A newspaper type of presentation? It would seem there must be something wrong with the SS to account for the low sales. I favour having a Committee to look at the SS, receive suggestions and correspondence from the individuals who criticise it, for consideration of Conference next year. Critchfield, Ealing: The last time the Party had a committee of this kind was in 1963, a fair time ago. As a result of their report you have the present "S.S.". It is now the time to have another look at it. We would like the committee to have a wide range of terms of reference to get a general co-ordinated view. Barltrop, S.S.P.C.: Re the sales of the SS, as far as I know, the sales over the last 16 or 17 years have been around their present level. They have not gone down very much since 1957. However good the SS is, sales eventually depend on factors other than the quality of the articles in it. Members need to try and sell it. In the earlier years of the Party sales of the SS were a by-product of outdoor meetings - this is the difficulty you have now to get over. Comrade Miller says the committee should find out what kind of SS the membership wants. In 1958 we invited members to give their views and the large number of letters which we received showed that there were two main suggestions - one, that it should be a serious theoretical journal for the serious-minded only and the other, that we should seek popularity by popular devices - jokes, pin-up girls etc. I think the Party is still divided on this. These two views cannot be reconciled. Re the quality of articles, remember that we publish articles that members send us - we only edit them. The bulk of the material is what is contributed by members. 'Why do we not write about ecology etc.?' We can only ask members to write these articles.

Re paper and price, the losses on the SS are very considerable and we have had to consider ways and means of trying to reduce them. We were advised to try out a cheaper (but quite good) paper which would save us about £25 a month. We would welcome continuous ideas from members as to the kind of thing they would like to see in the SS, and what they think of the SS at present. If we can have at any given time the current views of members, providing it is within our power and we have the people able to do the work, this is the best way to keep the SS as good as it can be. This would be better than having a Committee. Members of the SSFC are willing to address Branches on what they would like the SS to be. Many members do not know what goes on in the production of the SS and what is required of writers.

Birmingham Amendment	LOST 7 - 31
Ealing resolution	CARRIED 22 - 14
Westminster Amendment	" 22 - 10
as sub-Res:	CARRIED unanimously.



The Chairman here read the E.C.'s resolution shown in E.C. Report of 10th May:-

"That the price of the SS be raised to 6p a copy and that cheaper paper be used, subject to confirmation by the 1973 Annual Conference".

Cox: E.C. The Party has to subsidise the loss on the SS which amounts to £1.01 a month, £1,200 a year. £23 is lost on SS sent to Branches, £15 lost on free copies to libraries, £20 lost on copies sent to WSP.US, £18 lost on stocks in hand, and £25 lost unaccounted for (perhaps still in the hands of Branches).

Camden supported the increase in price to 6p. Mid.Herts. opposed because of possible loss in sales. Barltrop. The printer charges £5 a month to deliver the SS to us. If a member could undertake to collect the SS this would save £50 a year. On some pages of the SS we have three columns instead of two, which makes for variety - but it costs us £11 an issue. I suggest there should be closer control and consideration given to the number of copies ordered each month. I feel we pay for many copies which are not sold. The E.C. set up a sub-Committee to go into printing costs of various printing firms. We had estimates for photo litho offset, but the cost was the same as letter press printing. Comparing Narods over a period with other printing firms we found there was hardly any difference. Would it be cheaper to print outside London? This was true in two cases, but you must balance against this the loss in convenience. Before Xmas the printer told us that because of holidays and general pressure of work they could not produce the January issue till the 3rd. I was able to attend at the printers and succeeded in getting it out earlier. This could not be done if the printing was done outside London.

Floor Res. "That the price of the SS be raised to 6p and cheaper paper be used - both as soon as possible".  
Buick & McKone

Vanni, opposed - we have not had sufficient time to consider this matter in our Branches. K.Knight: I disagree with some of Cde.Barltrop's figures. We have not yet sufficient information and we should look at other printers or go into the matter of printing ourselves.

#### Resolution Carried 16 - 12

(b). Westminster "That the selling price of the Western Socialist remain at 5p"

Amend.

There was little discussion on this. Cde.Weidberg, Westminster said that the W.S. is hard to sell and we have a lot on hand. It should be sold at 5p. It is a good paper and worth subsidising.

Carried 22 - 10

as sub.Res.

\* unanimously

Arising out of the Overseas Contacts Report (Haringey Boh), Camden asked for more information regarding the 'ultra left groups' mentioned in this report. Buick: They are mainly groups which are in favour of a wage-less, Stateless society but advocate strike action. There is no such thing as a socialist group in Augsburg.

Central Organiser's Report. Cde.Skelton. I went to some trouble to get newsagents in my area to take the SS but I find that the E.C. has decided against this.

May. C.O. The E.C. is not against selling the SS through newsagents if it were possible. Several newsagents have been tried - one, after receiving two issues free of cost, said do not send us any more: even if we sold them all it would not be worth the space they occupied. Others only sold a few. It was on these grounds that we ceased trying to sell the SS on a wholesale basis, wholesalers won't touch it with a bargepole. They want a journal selling at 3/- or 4/-. The sales of the S.S. rests with members. In the GLC Elections in 3 weeks Westminster Branch sold between 300 and 400 copies of the April SS. If we can do this, why cannot other Branches? Glasgow sell more SS per month than the whole of the London Branches put together. On another aspect, Ealing Branch ran a meeting with a film show, costing a lot of money - but it was not advertised in the "S.S"! This is crazy. There is a time limit for insertion of adverts. in the SS. They must be in by the 12th of the month preceding the issue and you must work to this.

SATURDAY:

It was agreed that Comrades Benjamin and Medwell from Merseyside be allowed to sit as delegates.



AMENDMENTS TO RULE

Rule 1. Birmingham. "Insert the words 'which shall cost said members 10p per annum' between the words 'card' and 'showing' on line 13"  
LOST 7 - 31

Rule 2. Camden. "That the words 'Each member shall pay 5p (1/-) per week' on line 1, be deleted and replaced by 'Each member shall pay 25p per calendar month'...."  
CARRIED 25 - 13

Rule 2. Glasgow. "Delete after 'funds' on line 2 the words 'the only receipt recognised being the official due stamp'".  
LOST 19 - 19

Rule 8. Camden. "Delete the Rule and replace with 'Each Branch shall report its numerical strength and financial condition twice a year to the Executive Committee, namely for the half year ending 30th June and the half year ending 31st December, such report to be audited and sent to H.O. within two calendar months after the expiration of the half year. If a Branch fails to send in its report within the time specified the E.C. shall ask the Branch for an explanation and report the matter to the next following Delegate Meeting or Annual Conference or Special Conference and the delegates from the Branch concerned be allowed to sit only with the permission of the Delegate Meeting or Conference.'  
CARRIED 24 - 14

Rule 9. Camden. "That the words '4p (9d) per week' on line 2 be deleted and replaced by '20p per calendar month'".  
CARRIED 24 - 13

Rule 9. Glasgow and Westminster Addendum became redundant.

At this juncture Comrades Caulfield and Best made a formal request to sit as delegates for Manchester Branch. This caused considerable discussion. In answer to questions, the Manchester members stated that they had been given a free hand at a meeting of only 4 members, with no quorum. Lawrence, Camden. Whichever way you look at it they cannot represent Manchester Branch. They had no specific instructions from their Branch on the Agenda from a properly constituted meeting. They can express views but I suggest they cannot function as delegates. Manchester Branch has not sent in a Form "C" for 1972 or for 1973. Cox, S.O.Ctee: It says in the new rule (just carried above) that "If a Branch fails to send in its report to H.O. within the time specified the E.C. shall ask the Branch for an explanation....." Manchester Branch has not reported to the E.C. and the E.C. has not had a chance to consider the situation.

Chairman: My ruling is that the Manchester members are not allowed to sit.

Caulfield, Manchester: It would appear that the Conference should decide this matter - the Chairman is over-stepping his authority. Lawrence, Camden. The members are here, they can make observations but obviously, both according to the old rule and the amended rule just carried they are not eligible to sit.

Floor Res. Redbridge & Birmingham: "That the delegates be allowed to sit".

Chairman. I rule they cannot sit as properly constituted representatives of Manchester Branch. They have merely been given a free hand on everything and can only give a personal view.

Resolution: Westminster & S.W. London: "Next business" Lost 15 - 15

Resolution: Haringey & Edinburgh: "That the Chairman leave the Chair" Lost 14 - 15

Chairman then reads from Conference Standing Orders - "The ruling of the Chairman shall be binding unless challenged by one of the following motions - 'That the Chairman leave the Chair' or 'That the Chairman shall accept a vote of direction'".



Yanni, Glasgow: "I move that the Chairman accept a vote of direction on the question that Conference decides whether or not the Manchester delegates can sit".

The Chairman did not accept this resolution as Conference had just decided against a 'vote of direction' by trying to move him out of the Chair, and maintained that his ruling still stood.

Waters, Westminster. The Conference is now in the hands of the Chairman. We should take the bull by the horns and get on with the business.

Rule 10, Lewisham. "Delete Rule 10 and substitute 'Branches or members shall neither publish, sell nor distribute any literature which has not been approved by the E.C. excepting handbills advertising meetings'".  
LOST 5 - 32

Rule 10, Swansea. "Add at the end of Rule 10 'and leaflets expressing Party policy'".  
LOST 15 - 23

Rule 13, Camden. "That the first sentence of Rule 13 be amended to read 'The Executive Committee shall meet fortnightly but with power to convene Special Meetings'".

Lawrence, Camden. These regular weekly meetings put a great difficulty in the way of finding General Secretaries and E.C. members to take on this work. It makes a great call on members' time, most of them having to earn their own living during the day. Baldwin, E.C. An experiment with fortnightly meetings was made last summer but it did not work. Special meetings were called for to deal with the backlog of work. If Branches want adequate attention, to reduce E.C. meetings from 52 to 26 just won't do. K. Knight. Baldwin doesn't give a true picture of what happened last year. We only had an acting Secretary and some of the backlog was for this reason. The E.C. gets 9/10ths of the things it should not be dealing with. A lot of the routine stuff should be in the hands of Party Officers and sub-Committees. The E.C. should be dealing with things like propaganda. Fortnightly meetings would free members from sitting at E.C. every week and allow them to participate in Committee work. Cox. What takes up the time of the E.C. is correspondence from Branches re Party policy. We should leave it at weekly meetings. If we have nothing to do we can always miss a meeting.

D'Arcy, E.C. There were two items last year each of which took the E.C. till 9.30 to deal with, and this sort of thing takes place every Tuesday. Haringey Branch make unreasonable demands on the E.C. The time of the E.C. is not taken up with Branch correspondence. What you have on the E.C. is a talking-shop - it has become a Club. Also a lot of time has been spent on Swansea, Manchester and Haringey by putting points of view in opposition to the Party. We have had a long argument with Manchester Branch about Parliament and with Swansea Branch, and about what should or should not go in the "S.S". A lot of the work of the E.C. arises from the fact that there are different points of view in the Party, and these things are not in the nature of normal E.C. business. The E.C. should try fortnightly meetings and make an attempt to raise the level of E.C. discussion. Young, E.C. in favour of weekly meetings but thought there should be a time limit on members' contributions to discussion. May, Act. Gen. Sec. At the moment we have had no nominations for General Secretary and the closing date is 8th May. If the E.C. got down to things properly fortnightly meetings would give us a wider choice of members who might be willing to serve. E.C. members attend their Branches, and the people who can attend 52 meetings a year is limited. The E.C. should be more businesslike, starting at 7.30 instead of 8 p.m. Members who have done a day's work are not at their best at 11 o'clock at night.

LOST 18 - 19



Rule 16, Haringey. "Insert in line 2 after the word 'to', the words 'or Chairman of'".

Rule 16, Haringey. "Delete the words 'to speak thereat' on line 5 and substitute the words 'of reply and may with permission contribute to the discussion'".

Rule 16, Westminster. "Delete Rule 16 entirely and re-number subsequent rules".

These three amendments were discussed together.

Waters. If an E.C. member is a delegate his vote is decided by his Branch. There seems to be some fear that the E.C. somehow wants to take over the Party as the leadership elite. This is ridiculous. An E.C. member may be able to put a point of view on a particular subject better than anyone else. The E.C. members should have the same right as other members to put forward his Branch's point of view.

Lawrence, Camden. E.C. members have always been able to make their point of view heard at Conferences. All matters for discussion are not instructed. The present procedure has worked satisfactorily. Cox, Westminster. All delegates, whether E.C. members or not, represent their Branch's views. They should not be considered second-class members. There is an inequality here between one member and another. I would like to be able to represent my Branch. Baldwin. What Conference is reviewing and to some extent criticising is the work of the E.C. over the year. If E.C. members were delegates Conference might be loth to criticise the E.C.

Westminster's Amend. LOST 6 - 32

both Haringey's Amendments LOST 6 - 22

Rule 17, Swansea. "Insert on line 2 after the words 'Party literature', the words 'that is, any journal, pamphlet or leaflet in the name of the Party nationally....' And delete on line 5 after the words 'Socialist Parties abroad...' the words 'and otherwise generally supervise the work of the Party....'".

LOST 14 - 21

Rule 19, Lewisham. "Add after the words 'Party Officers' on line 2 the words 'all such officers shall be subject to the control of the E.C. who shall specify their Terms of Reference'".

LOST 9 - 28

Rule 19, Haringey. "Delete all from the word 'subject' on line 5 to the words 'Party Officers' on line 9 inclusive".

LOST 18 - 19

Resolution: Camden. - "That any amendments to Rules 2 and 9 concerning the payment of dues, carried at this Conference, shall take effect as from 1st January, 1974".

CARRIED 34 - 4

PRIVATE ADVERTISING. Full details of this matter, which was referred to Conference by the E.C., are given in the Final Agenda, where four recommendations are set out. It was agreed that the report be adopted for discussion.



There was a good deal of discussion on these recommendations and it appeared that only four Branches had fully considered the matter. The main concern of delegates seemed to be to make it clear that while we do not wish to prevent anybody putting in a private advert, it should not be done in the name of the Party. An amendment to (c) was moved by Haringey to delete from 'this' on line 4 to 'S.P.C.B' on line 7, which was LOST 11 - 14

Haringey's addendum to (d): "Add at the end of (d) 'and to donate any money he/she may have to spend on furthering the cause of socialism to the Party's General Fund' was CARRIED 13-12

Resolution Mid.Herts. & Westminster - "Delete all after 'arrangement' in (b) including items (c) and (d)". was CARRIED 15 - 11  
(which automatically precludes Haringey's resolution (above) which was carried 13-12).

The final Resolution to go forward was:

"Since 1971 Conference no private advertisements by individual members using the name of the Party have been permitted by the E.C. and as far as we know, no such advertisements have appeared. This Conference recommends that this be continued as a permanent arrangement.

CARRIED 13 - 12

(There was a resolution by Camden Branch: "But that this shall not prevent an individual member from inserting an advert. at his own cost provided that he first obtain the authority of the E.C. to do so" : lost 9 - 18).

#### ITEM for DISCUSSION      Party Activity

3 (b). S.W.London. "The GLC Elections April 1973 (which the Party will have contested in 11 Constituencies")

Young. With the exception of two Constituencies we each gained about 100 votes, and it seems a reasonable assumption that if we had put up 111 candidates we still would have obtained about 100 votes each. This was the first time the name of the Party was explicitly spelled out on the Ballot Paper. Technical Colleges are the best places to speak at and personal canvassing is good. A definite vote of 100 seems to be the most support that the Party can rely on at the moment. How are we going to break this barrier? We should go to the market places and talk to people as other candidates do. McGuinness. Members should write in to the radio programmes more - "Any Questions", "Any Answers". Haringey. The Party should have put up at least 20 candidates to gain London wide publicity. We distributed 15,000 leaflets - 5,000 of the Party manifesto and 10,000 of our own leaflet. We tried to get something in the local paper every week, but only succeeded in doing this with the Hampstead and Highgate Express. We sold 7 doz. SS outside Tube Stations. London Live Publicity. The Party's name appeared on all the official Election notices as well as on the Ballot Paper (as at the last Election), so that if you get nothing else you get publicity if you have a candidate. We got coverage in the London daily papers for Hornsey and Hampstead. In the London edition of the daily papers the results were given in full with the Party shown separately - in two cases we were called 'Independents'. We also got a mention in various interviews on Radio London. Local Elections are the best for publicity. If we had put up 92 candidates we could have claimed more time from the Broadcasting authorities.

May, Westminster. There was a good response from members. In Westminster and Camden areas there were some 30 members and two non-members taking part - 22 from Westminster Branch. I do not agree that street corner meetings are finished - in many places, yes, but it is good in Hampstead where we had one of the best outdoor meetings we have ever had in several years. There are places available if you try to find them. In Camden we sold approx. 450 SS, 400 of these at railway stations. We had a work chart and we flooded places like Hampstead, Belsize Park, showing good results. One thing stood out clearly - we should have had a Press Agent who is literally doing nothing else during the campaign. Two members appeared on BBC London and for the first time we had a letter from the head of the BBC himself.

We thought we should have been given more time on the 'Call-in' programmes, 5 in all. The Communist Party were on one lasting two hours but it was considered we did not have enough candidates. We should look at these points in future.



There was considerable discussion on this Item. A summary of some of the points made is as follows:-

Waters, There has been a lot of discussion recently in relation to the hostility clause which seems to have suggested an escape route for people who apparently want to join other organisations which I would claim upon investigation and analysis in relation to the class struggle, would prove to be political organisations in the sense that we understand it. We know that the Communist Party for years has used all sorts of 'front' organisations with obnoxious titles, going through the whole gamut of social activity. If we considered altering the D. of P. we should insert something that specified political parties and organisations which can be shown by analysis to be in support of the capitalist system. I think it is a dangerous attitude to say that the 'Shelter' Group etc. are not really political parties. We should deal with the hostility clause in the way in which it is trying to define opposition to organisations which are in fact supporting capitalism, not trying to abolish it. Cottis: Members may be involved as individuals in these pressure groups but we should remember that it has nothing to do with the Party.

D'Arcy: The difference between the Party's attitude to Trade Unions and reforms generally seems to confuse a number of members. As far as the old members are concerned, the view we take is this - Trade Unions are specifically organised for the purpose of trying to get a larger share of the product and you are not committed politically at all. When you try to extend this into the field of reforms, what happens? Here we find something different. There are about seven groups of Women's Lib, a whole vast empire of reforms - higher family allowances etc. Women's Lib. publishes a paper called 'Women's Reform' which actually urges its members to write to their M.P.s. and lobby them. In other words, all reforms must eventually lead to the Statute Book and find a way through a Political Party. The only way they can achieve their reforms is through governmental action - they are reformist organisations and the Party's attitude towards reforms is quite clear.

Buick: Most Party members are active in outside organisations such as Tenants Association. Most of them are active in Trade Unions. Members do participate in outside organisations of a voluntary defensive character. The difficulty comes from failing to draw a distinction between what can be called defensive organisations concerned with getting a bit more but which are not out to obtain political power. We should make a distinction between a defensive organisation and a Trade Union. If the organisation approaches a reformist attitude then members should get out.

Knight: The E.C. should look into these organisations and members should say to the E.C. "Can I join" and the E.C. will then consider the matter. Parltrop, There is nothing whatever in the Party's rulings to prevent members going to the E.C. and asking, is it O.K.? In some such cases in the past the E.C. has said, yes. You should look at what the organisation exists for. It has been said that some organisations can be useful as long as they can be reconciled with socialist principles, but anything can be useful within the limits of your point of view, and there are dangers in this. Women's Lib. can be useful but these people are not conscious of themselves as workers but only as women. You should bring forward a proposition, take it to the E.C. specifically, not in general terms. The position as it exists today is satisfactory. Political organisations are barred to members of the Party. Other organisations can only be judged on their merits and only as specific organisations.

Baldwin: The organisations to which Comrade Skelton refers assume that capitalism can solve some particular problem. These problems - wages, prices, rents, Women's Lib. etc. cannot be solved within capitalism. Are we as members of the working class to have two identities, one as Party members and the other as members of Tenants' Associations, a split personality? It suggests we can solve the problems with which capitalism confronts us - high rents or low rents? We all know that low rents coincides with low wages. Comrade Skelton says they can be useful until they show their political policies, then we should drop them. We should dismiss them out of hand. You can waste hours discussing which are useful and defensive and which are not. Trade Union action is essentially industrial and concerns workers in the class struggle. To join a Parent Teachers Assn. as an individual is different from coming to Conference and saying the Party should support Teachers' Associations.

(In reply to a question, the Chairman read an extract from an E.C. Report (No.15) which stated that a resolution to set up a committee to examine the Women's Lib. Groups was lost).



Devereux. It is clear that Clause 7 means what it says. Many of us belong to organisations for our immediate interests but we do so knowing the full implications of our actions as Party members and taking full responsibility for them. Under no circumstances should we do anything which would implicate the Party wrongly. If they compromise the Party politically we should get out. All these organisations which attempt to do something inside of capitalism are essentially reactionary. These people are only interested in their particular object. Hardy. The Party has an answer to all this. We look at the working class as a whole - not the postal workers or the printing workers. We say, is this activity good for the working class as a whole. If so, O.K. If not, the Party as a Party is not in favour of it. Most of these sectional benefits are in the short term, but in the long run they are useless to the working class.

Ballard. The problem is, what exactly is politics? Is it merely concerned with political power? What we want is the politics of everyday life which involves other aspects of it. As socialists we should be active in these fields - education, hospitals, etc. putting the socialist case. We are a Party that puts forward a solution to working class problems such as education, housing, and between people generally. We have an interest in them. We should not have a generalised approach but consider each movement as it comes along and judge it on its merits - does it serve the interest of the working class? We should struggle against capitalist problems in all its forms. Women's Lib. is useful - it creates a level of organisation amongst women, helps to break down barriers between members of the working class. We should recognise the value they do have and as socialists push it further and show their limitations as well.

#### RESOLUTIONS

4(a). Haringey: "That this Conference endorses the statement on page 133 of the September 1972 S.S. i.e. that the Party would have supported the one-day TUC general strike to secure the release of the five jailed dockers".

Amend. S.W. London "Delete all after 'endorses' on line 1 of the above Resolution and replace with 'the statement by the 69th E.C. at their 46th Meeting (12th December 1972).'"

Amend. Camden: Virtually the same as S.W. London's.

Devereux, Camden. Our amendment contains the word 'implications'. It has been argued, rightly or wrongly, that the dockers' strike to secure the release of the 5 jailed dockers was a political strike, and whether that is right or wrong, the fact is that we might have to stand up in defence of that strike on political grounds. We do not as a Party take the line that we are bound to oppose or support strikes because this is not what we are in business for - this is the Trade Unions' job.

Buick. My Branch thought that this strike would have been seen in the sense that it would have been in line with the interests of the working class at that particular time. What was the alternative? To have passively accepted what the Government was doing? The Government is involved in trying to weaken the power of the Trade Unions. The Industrial Relations Act is blatantly anti working class. The E.C. tried to draw a rigid distinction between wages arguments and political action - Governments are employers. This distinction between political and industrial is becoming absorbed. It was essentially an industrial strike taking a political form.

Hardy. What Haringey is proposing is a complete departure from the attitude of the Party for many years past. We have supported the idea of industrial strikes and of general strikes, meaning simultaneous strikes of the Unions - industrial general strikes - but not to bring all the workers out. The real general strike is aimed at getting at the employers in the place where it matters and to bring out as few workers as possible - to bring pressure against employers because when trade is booming they do not want production interfered with. When business is depressed the employers do not care whether you stop production or not - they may lock workers out, and there is very little you can do at this stage. Over-riding both situations is the fact that those who control the machinery of government can dominate society and they can beat the workers any time they care to fight to a finish. They could pass a law banning all strikes. What can you do in a general strike against the Army? While you can put pressure on employers you cannot do it against government. The Government's survival is at stake they will fight to a finish.

The general strike over the dockers was not a



demonstration and not a serious strike of any kind. No Government is going to take notice of a one day strike. The dockers were not fighting the employers about wages but against other workers, dividing the working class. We are asked to believe that the T.U.C. called a General Strike but it was really a protest. The T.U.C. is not a Trade Union - it is the political organ of Trade Unions. and it cannot call anybody out: it can only ask them to do it. The dockers were jailed for contempt of Court, not for striking. According to an Act of 1875 a worker could be jailed for striking but this has now been repealed by the Industrial Relations Act. I challenge all the statements made by Haringey Branch. For years strikes were illegal. The Trades Disputes Act of 1927 made all political and sympathetic strikes illegal. But whatever the law, no law has ever prevented Unions from being formed, even when illegal. Employers need a body to negotiate with. The Party is opposed to the closed shop which is useful to the big employers but no use to the members. Workers can now decide by a majority vote. The Party's attitude is, leave the Trade Unions to look after their own affairs. Trade Union members are not socialists - they are Tory, Labour or Communist. The only way they can get Acts revised is to do a deal with Political Parties. Get out of the Trade Union business - it will lead you inevitably into the reformist field.

Ballard: We should be encouraging workers to engage in rank and file activity against this Act. Let us remind ourselves that we pose socialism to solve the workers' problems. This is part of the class struggle. We want to spread working class solidarity. Vanni, agreeing with Camden and S.W.London in supporting the E.C's statement - Striking on sound lines means striking for wages. But there are other things such as conditions of work, holidays etc. How are the working class to struggle effectively if they simply sit back and allow without a fight the rights they have to be whittled away by Government action. In those countries where they do not have universal franchise or the right to form Trade Unions socialists would put forward demands for those rights. But with this difference - separately and not in conjunction with other organisations doing the same thing. If it is right to fight for wages why is it wrong to fight for rights that you do have and try to maintain them? The issue is, should a Trade Union sit back and allow Governments to take away certain rights. I do not agree that Trade Unions can get round any law.

K. Knight. Mid.Herts. supports both amendments. Workers have been jailed before but the Party has taken no action. On this occasion the dockers were jailed for Contempt of Court. We are being asked to declare that this Trade Union Act is different and unique. There are features in this Act which we do not like but there are others which are an improvement. We should not be involved in what is a reform of the Trade Union movement.

Deveroux. Comrades Vanni and Ballard have referred to this as a specific issue but they talk about matters of principle. We say that this is not a specific issue but an issue of principle - of the Party's attitude towards Trade Unions and strikes. The Party's case has always been simple, as stated in the E.C's statement. Do we want to stand by this or alter it? I ask Comrade Ballard to say in what way his attitude to the strike which he wants us to endorse further the interests of the Party and in some way gives us some advantage in our propaganda in relation to the working class.

I have found that I am not able to put over the case for socialism any better inside a Trade Union - very often it is more difficult. We should separate ourselves from the political activities in the Trade Unions as far as they are inconsistent.

Buick: We do not say the Party should support a movement against the Industrial Relations Act or that it is vital. All we seek to do is to endorse the statement in the SS. in September 1972. We are asked, what advantage can accrue to the Party from expressing support for this action? We are a working class Party and we seek to be the instrument the working class can use to establish socialism. Therefore we must stand by the interest of the working class. As long as capitalism lats the working class should put up a struggle to defend its standard of living. This is how it is to our advantage. It conforms with the claim made in our D. of P.

S.W.London Amendment	Lost 16 - 19
Camden "	Lost 18 - 21
Haringey Resolution	Lost 19 - 20



4 (b)

HaringeyThe Socialist Party & Economic Organisation

" This Conference reaffirms the Party's policy on the necessity of working-class economic as well as political organisation for the establishment of Socialism, as expressed in the "S.S" in July 1915, November 1937 and May 1966, namely: " (see Final Agenda).

Amend.

Westminster: "Delete all after 'Socialism', on line 3 of the above Resolution".

Amend.

Camden: "Delete all after 'Conference' in line 1 of the above Resolution and replace with 'endorses the statement passed by the 69th E.C. on 15th August 1972, headed "Statement in the May 1972 S.S" which is as follows--  
(see Final Agenda)

(It was agreed that the discussion should be general rather than take the amendments first).

Devereux: Haringey has referred to three articles in the "S.S", but if we read these articles in their entirety they are seen to be arguments against the economic organisation of the working class for the establishment of socialism. The effect of these articles is completely opposite to the meaning of the Haringey resolution.

Waters, opposing the Haringey resolution; the argument used by Haringey gives the impression that in some way the present Trade Unions could become socialist in character but the fact is that Trade Unions are tied to Political Parties and reformist solutions. I cannot endorse completely what Hardy says about the closed shop because in certain circumstances it can be a weapon in the hands of a particular Trade Union. I agree that our ability to put over the socialist case in Trade Unions is very limited. Therefore to take up the position of trying to get existing Trade Unions to become socialist is indulging in unreality. We should concentrate on socialist propaganda among Trade Union members but not oppose them as a Political Party. We should keep out of Trade Unions where we have to wear two hats.

Buick, Haringey: I agree that the closed shop is a bad thing from a Trade Union point of view. The Party says that when workers acquire socialist ideas in industry priority will be given to the political organisation which is aiming at control of the State machine. At the same time workers will be organised in economic organisations which they will work out for themselves, before becoming fully merged in a full socialist society. We support Westminster's amendment and agree with Sections 1. and 3 of Camden's statement. Ballard, Ealing: In our propaganda we do not sufficiently emphasise the economic changes that may be required. We tend to give the impression that there will only be a government act. We should recognise that organisation on an economic level is essential and should take place before socialist revolution. We are opposed to both Westminster and Camden amendments but we are also not happy about Haringey's resolution. Wood, Lewisham, opposing Haringey and supporting the amendments: Why do we have to re-affirm something? Is it because there is some doubt about it? When workers are socialist they will know that society must produce things and will know how to set about it.

D'Arcy, Camden: The establishment of socialism does not depend on economic organisation, it depends on political organisation, and you do not ride two horses. We have always made a distinction between the role of the Socialist Party in the political field and the economic organisation field. Until we have socialism we are left with economic organisation within existing circumstances, that is the Trade Unions. I say that the object behind Haringey's resolution is that we should introduce a different aspect of the Party's case involving the Trade Unions in it. But the Party cannot recognise two different organisations.

Camden Amendment	Lost 11 - 23
Westminster amendment	Lost 18 - 21
Haringey Resolution	Lost 19 - 20

The E.C.'s Report to Conference was accepted on a motion by Wood & Cottis.

The Item for Discussion "What is a Capitalist?", deferred from last Delegate Meeting, was not dealt with. It was agreed on a motion by Vanni and Cottis that it be dealt with at the next Delegate Meeting, as first item.

Comrade Highams wished to make a statement regarding the present state of Party premises. The Chairman did not accept this as he considered it was not a matter for Conference but for the E.C. RESOLUTION: Vallance & Benjamin: "That a vote of direction be made to the Chairman to allow a short discussion on the subject of the Premises Committee".

LOST 8 - 15